

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the FINAL REJECTION mailed August 31, 2006. Reconsideration of this application in view of the below remarks is respectfully requested. Claims 1 – 11 are pending in the application with Claim 1 being in independent form. By the present amendment, Claim 1 is amended. No new subject matter is introduced into the disclosure by way of the present amendment.

I. Rejection of Claims 1 – 10 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1 – 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,777,383 issued to Stager et al.

In response, Claim 1 has been amended to recite: “the interconnect pads forming a plurality of I/O cells including signal terminals, a portion of the I/O cells forming a first group of I/O cells and another portion of the I/O cells forming a second group of I/O cells disposed on an inner position of the mounting member with respect to the first group of I/O cells.”

Stager et al., discloses a semiconductor chip package with interconnect layers. The Stager et al., package includes a plurality of interconnect pads. However, these interconnect pads, as disclosed in Stager et al., are formed into one group (See: Stager et al., FIG. 2).

In contrast, Applicant’s invention, as recited in independent Claim 1, forms the plurality of interconnect pads into a plurality of I/O cells, which are grouped into a first group of I/O cells and a second group of I/O cells. The second group of I/O cells is disposed at an inner position of the mounting member with respect to the first group of I/O cells.

It is well-settled by the Courts that “[A]nticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the

claim.” Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GMBH v. American Hoist and Derrick Company, et al.,
730 F.2d 1452, 221 USPQ 481 (Fed. Cir., 1984).

Therefore, as demonstrated above, because Stager et al., does not disclose each and every element recited in the present claims, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection has been obviated. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection with respect to Claims 1 - 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

II. Rejection of Claim 11 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Stager et al., in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,271,478 issued to Horiuchi et al.

Horiuchi fails to overcome the deficiencies identified above in Stager et al., namely Horiuchi, taken alone or in any proper combination with Stager et al., does not disclose or suggest interconnect pads forming a plurality of I/O cells including signal terminals, a portion of the I/O cells forming a first group of I/O cells and another portion of the I/O cells forming a second group of I/O cells disposed on an inner position of the mounting member with respect to the first group of I/O cells, as recited in amended Claim 1.

Claim 11 depends from independent Claim 1, and thus includes all the limitations recited therein by that independent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons provided above, Claim 11 is believed to be patentably distinct and allowable over the cited prior art references.

CONCLUSIONS

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all claims presently pending in the application, namely, Claims 1 – 11 are believed to be in condition for allowance and patentably distinguishable over the art of record.

If the Examiner should have any questions concerning this communication or feels that an interview would be helpful, the Examiner is requested to call Applicant's undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Esatto, Jr.

Registration No. 30,749

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER, P.C.
400 Garden City Plaza - Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

PJE:DAT:tam